analysis of Augustus Pitt-Rivers will be of interest to historians who deal with the impact of culture on the organization and scope of science.

Beyond these five papers, social historians will find little from which to choose. On the whole, the volume represents a clearly defined tradition (and genre) in the field of intellectual history. The emphasis is on culture rather than science, with religion playing the role of *éminence grise*. Further, in nine of the thirteen essays, individuals rather than problems are the focus of attention. Given the journal in which they appeared, these papers are not (by definition) comparative. The exception is Myers. This imposes a limitation that many historians would find excessively restrictive. Comparative analysis of the development of science often produces fruitful and stimulating findings. In form, these papers represent a kind of genteel tradition: neat expositions of clearly defined topics crafted with an eye toward elegance and style. There are, however, difficulties with problem selection and context (historiographical and, in a sense, scientific).

A casual comparison of recent volumes of *Victorian Culture* and *Isis*, published by the History of Science Society and subtitled *An International Review Devoted to the History of Science and Its Cultural Influences*, makes these differences clear. *Isis* papers explore not only traditional topics such as intellectual influences, but aspects of the social history of science as well. The latter are often organized using categories that might include gender or class and concerned with problems such as the dynamics of professionalization, the structure and nature of scientific communities or the politics of science policy. Frequently, they are also comparative. These papers generally address clearly defined historiographical concerns and, perhaps most importantly, *science* rather than *culture* is the primary concern.

For the most part, then, the essays in the Bratlinger volume represent a very different tradition from that which informs the new social history of science. While some of the fare contained in these pages is stimulating, much is not. It seems inevitable that the split between the culture of science and the culture of the humanities that began in Victorian Britain should, at length, make itself felt at the level of historical scholarship.

John Lankford
University of Missouri at Columbia

***

Thomas Brennan — *Public Drinking and Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. Pp. xiv, 333.

Thomas Brennan's book joins a growing collection of studies of eighteenth-century Paris, its people and culture. A generation ago, the urban historian's focus was fixed mostly on such large-scale matters as social structure, demography and the nature of popular revolt. More recently, largely as a result of the vogue of popular culture, interest has shifted to the micro-sociology of city life. Thus, Daniel Roche's comprehensive portrait of the consumption patterns and culture of the people of Paris; Arlette Farge's various studies of street life in the French capital; David Garrioch's detailed examination of social interaction among the Parisian *menu peuple*; and Robert

Isherwood's fascinating reconstruction of the new entertainments that graced Paris in the pre-revolutionary era: these and other like studies have not only brought to light the varied experiences of ordinary Parisians, but also address important questions, most particularly the relationship between elite and popular culture in an urban setting.

This is one of the main questions Brennan examines in the context of eighteenth-century tavern life. Indeed, one of many strengths of this smoothly written, well-researched book is that despite its concentration on a particular milieu and a rather limited set of experiences, it never loses sight of larger issues and manages to sustain a dialogue with an impressive range of historians of eighteenth-century urban culture. His fundamental goal is to rescue the tavern and its patrons from both the contempt of contemporaries and the neglect and condescension of historians. To be sure, drunkenness and violence routinely disturbed the tavern scene, and Brennan's analysis of the disorders that sometimes accompanied public drinking amounts to a valuable case study of criminality in the Ancien Régime. But the Parisian men (and some women) who regularly frequented taverns to partake of the libation and sociability available there did so mostly peaceably and in moderation. Moreover, they were people from virtually all segments of society, from noblemen and shopkeepers to craftsmen and laborers, not the dregs of society moralizers never ceased condemning as the typical tavern-goers.

This is not to say that within the tavern, one could find Estates General in miniature. Rather, its patrons were primarily of the Parisian laboring classes, broadly defined — workers, master artisans and shopkeepers —, with only a smattering of the elite. And it is this sociological profile, carefully assembled from the records of the *commissaires de police* which provide the archival basis of his study, that warrants Brennan's conclusion "that taverns were...an integral part of popular culture" (135). But he does more than demonstrate the popular — and thus also respectable — nature of the tavern; in the interactions and pastimes of tavern-goers, he discovers patterns of behavior and expressions of values that add to our understanding of the content of popular culture as well. For example, gambling, a common tavern pastime, was not considered primarily a matter of gain and competition, but rather "as a distributive mechanism, a way of randomly sharing the costs of...leisure" (251). Likewise, the sociabilty of the tavern milieu entailed more than simple companionship; it also "imposed certain obligations of consumption and expenditure" (14) between drinking partners. As much a public space as city streets and markets, the tavern was not simply a place for random, passing encounters between individuals, but rather a gathering spot for somewhat stable "drinking groups" — miniature "societies" which, while certainly less permanent and established than confraternities and guilds, still constituted a fundamental element of the associational world of the *menu peuple*. In short, like recent historians of the crowd in early modern Europe, Brennan successfully recovers the hidden logic and rationality, the ethos and value system of a behavior, public drinking, too often viewed in terms of the excess in which it was only sometimes indulged.

Brennan's study spans the period from 1691 to the Revolution, although his contribution to our view of the associational patterns of the Parisian laboring classes has obvious implications, which he acknowledges, for our understanding of the mobilization of the popular *sections* during the Revolution. Unlike other studies of popular culture, which often neglect the element of change, *Public Drinking and Popular Culture in Eighteenth-Century Paris* demonstrates that the tavern and its culture were hardly immune from the transformations that were reshaping urban life. Two such

transformations deserve special attention. The first was the growing split between popular and elite culture, the so-called withdrawal of the upper classes from the world of lower-class pastimes and entertainments, a thesis most forcefully proposed by Peter Burke in his influential book, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. Here, indeed, Brennan sides with Burke — as opposed to the view put forth by Isherwood in his *Farce and Fantasy* — that such a split did emerge, and offers supporting evidence from the world of the tavern. During the eighteenth century, elite views of public drinking grew more critical; writers and playwrights were less inclined to choose the tavern as the setting for their plots. Most significantly, elites simply entered taverns less frequently, preferring instead the relatively more genteel cafe, an important addition to eighteenth-century leisure life.

The cafe, in fact, was one element of a growing range of venues for public drinking, a second aspect of the transformations that marked eighteenth-century leisure at the popular level. The tavern was increasingly rivaled not only by the cafe, but also by new drinking spots outside the city limits, the *guinguettes*. The growth of total number of vendors of drink — cabarets, taverns, cafes, *guinguettes* and the like — was also impressive in the course of the century, from 3,000 to 4,000. This increase in the variety and number of venues was matched by the greater range of drinks: coffee, brandy and other spirits were now available in addition to the staple of wine. Even the operating hours of various vendors of drink were extended during the period — a full three hours into the evening. In short, the evidence Brennan has assembled adds to our view of the growth of a consumer culture in the eighteenth-century city — the growth both in the supply and availability of drink and, it would seem, of the demand for increased variety and accessibility on the part of consumers who presumably now had more to spend on leisure.

This leads to a question that Brennan does not consider. Historians have adopted the term popular culture to cover a range of experiences across several centuries — everything from traditional forms of life to the mass culture of the contempory era. The tavern was surely an element of popular culture, as the author stresses; but in the eighteenth century, it was also being transformed by the consumerism increasingly prevelant in virtually every level of society. When do the effects of consumerism transform popular culture to the point that it becomes, simply, a consumer culture — a culture defined less by tradition than by the accessibility of the market, less by the allegiance of its adepts than its easy appropriation by purchasers? It is the virtue of Thomas Brennan's excellent study that he affords us the opportunity to speculate on this and other questions.

Robert A. Schneider
Independent Scholar

***